DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 115 JC 700 260

AUTHOR Weigel, Mark
TITLE A Comparison of Persisters and Non-Persisters in a Junior College.
PUB DATE [69]
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the EPDA Institute for Advanced Study in Student Personnel Work in Junior Colleges and Technical Institutes, University of Missouri, Columbia, Sept. 9, 1969 to June 1, 1970

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.30
DESCRIPTORS *Dropout Identification, *Dropout Research, Institutional Research, *Junior Colleges, *Junior College Students, *Persistence, Prediction
IDENTIFIERS *Minnesota

ABSTRACT

Persisting and non-persisting students at Anoka-Ramsey State Junior College (Minnesota) were compared using non-intellective measures. The purpose of this comparison was to differentiate between the two groups through questionnaire responses indicating general characteristics, reasons for attending the junior college, appraisal of services offered by the college, and attitude toward the college environment. The sample consisted of two groups--100 male students in each--who entered the college in the fall of 1968. Response rates of 76 and 49 per cent were recorded for persisters and non-persisters, respectively. Chi-square tests for significance at the .05 level were applied to questionnaire responses. On general information items, no significant response differences were noted. The group of persisters differed significantly from non-persisters in selecting more often "preparation for a better paying job" and "encouragement by people outside the college" as reasons for attending a junior college. Appraisals of the college's services and environment showed persisters significantly more negative about a required general orientation course and significantly more positive about instructor assistance, campus recreational facilities, and emphasis on cultural and intellectual pursuits outside the class. The two reasons most often selected for leaving the college were "that another school would offer more of what I was interested in," and a general feeling of "not getting anywhere." (JO)

ED044115

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A COMPARISON OF PERSISTERS AND NON-PERSISTERS IN A JUNIOR COLLEGE

Mark Weigel
University of Missouri - Columbia

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Only in recent years has attention shifted from the use of four year college and university standards in judging junior college students to a concern for the student in the junior college environment. As junior colleges have become a more integral and powerful force in the educational scheme, the research emphasis has changed from how well students do in their transfer surroundings to how well they are fulfilling the standards of the junior college.

The drive to have regional agencies rather than state universities accredit junior colleges, the acceptance of the AA degree as fulfilling general education requirements at many schools, and the fact that first year college students are more likely to enter junior college than a four year school all emphasize the need to study the junior college student in relation to his immediate surroundings.

Research into attrition among junior college students is quite recent and not very conclusive. About the only literature related to attrition in community colleges can be found within the past three years in ERIC and because of the parsimony of past research the starting points and assumptions of these studies is usually the four year college or university. The comparisons are generally based upon the authority and experience of these schools and tend to ignore the uniqueness of the community college student.

JC 700 260

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
DEC 11 1970
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

This present study is an attempt to compare the characteristics of students who persist in a junior college with students who do not persist. The null hypothesis is that these groups of students will not differ from each other in general characteristics, in the reasons for attending a junior college, and in their appraisal of the services offered by the college or their view of the college environment. An attempt is also being made through this study to identify the reasons junior college students decide not to continue attending the junior college.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

If schools, particularly junior colleges, are to be considered the educational means to a cultural, social or vocational end, then the terms "attrition" and "dropout" become especailly difficult to define. In four year colleges and universities the measure of success can be scaled upon continuous enrollment until degree status is reached in a prescribed number of years. But the type of students, the variety of curricula and the changing nature of individual junior colleges defies definition of the dropout student, the successful student and the rate of attrition.

The vast amount of literature available on high school and college underachievement and dropouts emphasize the national and personal tragedies resulting from these problems. Not all authors writing on attrition in junior colleges are convinced that dropping out is an irreversible evil that must be counteracted. The uniqueness of the junior college frame of reference allows the student to use the school when it is needed to consider the school a means to an end rather than a way of life. Hughes (1968) thought that 80 per cent of dropouts will find their way back into

college; Roueche (1967) reported that Orange Coast College anticipated 94 per cent of dropouts will return, 58 per cent of that number to the junior college; and Aiken's survey (1968) indicated that two out of three junior college dropouts said they would return.

The Definition of Dropouts

When loosely defining successful junior college students as those students who either transferred, completed 80 quarter hours in two years with a GPA of 1.75 or above, or completed 60 vocational hours in two years with a GPA of 1.75, Rice (1969) was left with 66 per cent of the junior college students at his institution classed as unsuccessful. Cohen (1969) defined the dropout as the student who did not finish the first semester or enroll in the second semester, but Hughes (1968) did not classify a student as a dropout unless he had completed 30 units and did not stay to complete 59 units. Wenzel (1968) talked of attrition when a student failed or withdrew from a single course. These varying definitions should be kept in mind as we consider the characteristics of the "dropout".

Types of Instruments Used

Attrition studies attempt to isolate two kinds of descriptive factors: intellective and non-intellective. The instruments used in the studies were dependent upon the kind of information sought and the definition of the dropout.

Elias (1968) used high school and first semester college grade point averages to predict dropouts, and Black (1969) also attempted an intellective description of the dropout by developing a regression equation using high school GPA and ACT scores to predict withdrawers, probationers, and students who were academically dismissed. After a comprehensive look into research

projects of junior college dropouts, Roueche (1967) concluded that "Academic ability scores (high school averages and SAT scores) appear to be of no value in predicting junior college dropouts."

Roueche's second conlcusion that "There are certain non-intellective differences between students who persist and those who drop out" describes the factors searched by the majority of studies of attrition. Hughes (1968), Aiken (1968), McGeever (1965), Rice (1969) and the majority of studies reported by Roueche (1967) used questionnaires to determine the nonintellective differences between the persisters and the dropouts.

Hannah (1969) reported the use of the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) in his study of the attrition rates at various colleges. Cohen (1969) incorporated the OPI with the Adaptive Flexibility Inventory, a demographic questionnaire, the Henmon-Nelson, Cooperative English and a reading comprehension test in an effort to find the difference in personality correlates between dropouts and persisters. Using the Student Profile section of the ACT program, Wood (1968) characterized persisters, withdrawers and dismissed students on the basis of their responses upon entrance into college.

Pervin (1967) developed the Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment (TAPE) under sponsorship of the Office of Education to provide an "Analysis of student-college interaction and the relationship of such interaction to student dissatisfaction and dropouts."

Results

To predict academic success, Black (1969) found that high school GPA and only the English subtest of the ACT (of all of the subtests) contributed to predictive efficiency. Rice (1969) also found high school GPA's significant at the .05 level in predicting college success. In studying the role

of intellective variables in the achievement of associate degree students, Elisa (1968) concluded that ". . .aptitude and past performance are more important for associate degree students than for baccalaureate degree student success." But Roueche (1967) arrived at the opposite pole by concluding that high school averages and entrance test scores are of little value in predicting junior college dropouts.

Although Aiken (1968) found that the group of dropouts and the group of persisters which he studied were more alike than they were different, he did conclude that dropouts were older, more were married, they had lower GPA's, and more were planning to continue working. The continuers wanted only to complete their education.

Rice (1969) found significant differences (.05) between persisters and dropouts in the areas of sex, declared major, proximity to school, and fathers' occupation. Hughes (1968) characterized a dropout as a day student, married, no military service, working 26-40 hours per week, parents with 12 years of education, one parent at the professional or managerial level, and who planned to transfer for an AB degree or higher.

Even though Cohen (1969) used questionnaires, ability tests, achievement tests, and personality inventories he found nothing of major significance to differentiate junior college dropouts from junior college persisters. He did state that further research could profitably be conducted on the Complexity Scale of the OPI, the number of units attempted, the number of schools a dropout attended prior to grade 10, and the amount of mother's education.

Hannah (1969) also reported OPI research on the school leavers and distinguished groups in conservative colleges from those in liberal colleges.

Generally the OPI described the leavers as more impulsive, complex, independent, and less willing to create a good impression. Upon leaving, these students were described as uncertain, ambivalent, not relieved at putting college behind them, not uncertain about their abilities, but not confident about their futures.

McGeever (1965) ranked the following causes for dropping out: poor scholarship, financial, lack of interest, sickness, disciplinary dismissal, needed at home, and death.

The approach by Wood (1968) using the Student Profile section of the ACT characterized the students who withdraw as wanting careers unrelated to the majors offered at the school, an interest in acting, music, debating and intramural activities. The students who were dismissed were more likely to have engaged in more athletic programs, intramurals and more likely to be engaged or going steady.

From this review of literature, it is apparent that more study is necessary to define and to work with the dropout in a local junior college framework. Other than a few of the studies involving intellective factors, research in this area has been aimed at describing the dropout rather than trying to compare him with successful students in his environment of the junior college. This study is an attempt to describe some of the ways persisters in a junior college differ from non-persisters.

METHOD

Instrument

The STUDENT FOLLOW-UP STUDY questionnaire used in this study was designed to elicit four kinds of information: general background and present school attendance; reasons for first entering the junior college;

an appraisal of college services and environment; and the reasons for discontinuing at the junior college. For comparative purposes it was necessary to have each subject respond to every item.

Subjects

The questionnaires were sent to two groups of 100 male students each who entered Anoka-Ramsey State Junior College, Minnesota in the fall of 1968. The persisters were the first 100 students on an alphabetized list who returned for the fall quarter, 1969. The non-persisters, students not in attendance fall quarter, 1969, were randomly matched with the persisters using the Composite Score of the ACT Tests.

To eliminate other variables, the students who previously attended another college, who completed less than 12 credits, who did not persist for the entire first quarter (and therefore did not generate a grade point average), or who did not have ACT scores available were not included in the study.

Analysis of Data

A *t*-ratio was used to compare the ACT Composite scores of the groups of responders. A *t*-ratio was also used to compare the means of the GPA's of the two groups.

Chi square was applied to the 58 questions of the comparative data reported in the General Information, College Entrance, and Appraisal of College Services sections.

The last 28 questions, the Reasons for Discontinuing section, were tabulated through frequency count and ranked in order of positive responses.

RESULTS

Response

Two mailings produced a 75.8 per cent response from persisting students and a 48.8 per cent response from the non-persisters. Among the latter group, parents returned 14 answer sheets with the explanation that their son was in the service and was not available to answer the questionnaire. These 14 plus 2 incorrect addresses were not figured into the percentage responding.

The *t*-ratio comparing the means of the ACT Composite Scores (Table 1) showed no significant difference between the two groups. However, using a *t*-ratio to compare the two groups on GPA after one quarter (Table 2), a significant difference was noted in the mean GPA of 2.370 for the persisters compared with 2.004 for those who did not persist (significant at the .05 level).

General Information

None of the responses to the questions in the General Information section was significant at the .05 level. Typically, the individuals in the two groups were single, non-veterans, worked 11 or more hours per week while in school, entered junior college right after high school, were in the transfer curriculum, and planned on a bachelor's degree.

Of the 42 students in the sample of non-persisters, 27 had enrolled in another school, 12 of that number at the state university. Of the remaining students who had withdrawn and were not presently in another school, none stated that they had no plans to attend college again. These intentions of return are at the level found by Hughes (1968), Roueche (1957) and Aiken (1968).

College Entrance

Two questions were found to significantly distinguish the persisters from the non-persisters on the reasons for attending junior college (Table 3). The persisters considered preparing for a better paying job (.01) and the encouragement of people outside of school (.05) as of more importance than did the non-persisters.

Preparing for a better paying job and thinking that college would help in vocational choice drew the most positive response among reasons for entering junior college in both groups. The persisters rated third most positive the statement, "I felt that to know what is going on these days you have to go to college." The non-persisters rated as the third most positive statement, "I thought that college would give me the chance to meet people."

The three statements which were judged "Does not apply," most often among the persisters were: ". . .not much else for me to do but go to college," ". . .college could make me a better husband and father," and "All of my friends were going to college." The non-persisters agreed on the first two, but judged that "College would give me a more influential voice in community affairs," as third least applicable to them.

Appraisal of College Services

Of the 32 questions relating to the appraisal of college services and of the school environment, five were judged as significant at the .05 level. (Table 4)

Although both groups were negative about the required General Orientation course, the persisters were significantly more negative.

The persisters were more positive about the assistance they received from instructors: 88 per cent of the persisters and 64 per cent of the non-persisters responded at least "Fairly satisfactory" to this item. 48 per cent of the persisters and 24 per cent of the non-persisters were satisfied with the emphasis on cultural and intellectual pursuits outside of class. However, 13 per cent of the former group and 29 per cent of the latter did not think this item applied to them.

The persisters were more satisfied with the recreational facilities on campus than were the non-persisters. Wood's finding (1968) that students who were dismissed were more likely to have engaged in more athletic programs and intramurals is related to the significance of this statement.

Almost half of the non-persisters were fairly well satisfied that campus publications reflect the interest and point of view of the student body. Those students who returned for the second year had a significantly lower response to this question.

The persisters rated as most positive the size of classes, the assistance from instructors, and the quality of teaching by the instructors. The non-persisters concurred on the first two aspects of college services but considered the opportunity for social contact as the third most positive aspect.

The persisters did not regard the required Orientation course, campus publications, and representative student government as satisfactory. The least satisfactory areas among the non-persisters were representative student government, the intellectual life on the campus, and the required Orientation class.

Reasons for Discontinuing

Of the 28 reasons to which non-persisters responded 14 of the reasons

for discontinuing were chosen over 12 per cent of the time (Table 5).

Coupling the fact that none of the students were drafted with the fact that 12 parents indicated their sons were in the service and not able to respond indicates an exclusion of a representative sample which includes these servicemen.

Over half of the non-persisters were in another school and apparently decided that another school would better fulfill interests and needs. A general feeling of "not getting anywhere" plus a lack of interest in studies and unhappiness about school led to the decision not to continue.

McGeever's (1965) ranking of reasons for not continuing were not borne out by this survey. Although students who did not persist had significantly lower GPA's than those who did persist, only one out of five were "Discouraged by low grades," and one out of 42 considered "College work too difficult." One of five students claimed financial difficulty, but only one of 42 dropped out because of illness, and none of the respondents left because they "were needed at home."

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This study was an attempt to compare samples of junior college persisters and non-persisters using non-intellective factors as the means of comparison. The authority of previous research was not very helpful in answering questions of non-intellective differences for several reasons. First, the literature is descriptive rather than comparative, and second, the definition of dropout or non-persister changes with each study.

The questionnaire used in this study attempted to identify significant differences between the groups in these areas: general characteristics;

reasons for first entering junior college; and appraisal of the school services and environment. Reasons for discontinuing were also elicited from the non-persisting group.

The sample of the non-persisters is biased because of the lack of servicemen responding and because of the total return of the sample, 48.6 per cent.

With approximately the same ability, the persisters had significantly better first quarter GPA's. Considering the Reasons for Discontinuing section, the reasons for the lower grades seems to be a symptom or function of a lack of interest in the academic programs and social provisions of the college rather than an inability to do the work. This fact is further demonstrated by considering that almost two-thirds of the non-persisters are now in another school. Among those who are not in school, none chose the "no plans to attend college again" response.

The retrospect necessary to answer the question of "Why junior college?" clouds the significance of this section. To a significantly greater extent, the persisters entered junior college to prepare for a better paying job and because they were encouraged by people outside of school to go on to college.

The persisters were more negative about the Orientation class, culture outside the classroom, and campus publications. They tended to rate assistance from instructors and recreational facilities significantly higher than the non-persisters.

The conclusion of this study concurs with the conclusions of Hughes (1968) and Aiken (1968) in that dropouts of junior colleges more often than not return to school. In this study the junior college apparently

did not offer the kinds of academic and social programs in which non-persisters were interested and so they went to other schools.

The academic and social comprehensiveness of the junior college will determine whether or not a student will persist in the junior college, or if he does not persist, whether or not he will return to it.

Table 1

Results of t Tests of Differences Between Means of Persisters and Dropouts on ACT Composite

GROUPS	MEANS	SD	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS
Persisters	19.85	4.22	1.34 (ns)*
Dropouts	18.78	3.91	

*(ns) Not significant

Table 2

Results of t Tests of Differences Between Means of Persisters and Dropouts on First Quarter GPA

GROUPS	MEANS	SD	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS
Persisters	2.37	0.64	2.32*
Dropouts	2.00	1.01	

* p > .05

Table 3

Reasons for College Entrance: Percentage Distribution and Chi-Square

	DOES NOT APPLY	SLIGHT IMPORT	MODERATE IMPORT	GREAT IMPORT	CHI SQ
21. I wanted to prepare for a better paying job.					
Persisters	8.1	4.1	24.3	63.5	12.653**
Dropouts	0.0	22.0	29.3	48.8	
22. People who I knew and respected outside school encouraged me to go.					
Persisters	16.0	29.3	36.0	18.7	9.209*
Dropouts	4.8	52.4	31.0	11.9	

* p > .05
** p > .01

Table 4

Appraisal of College Services:
Percentage Distribution and Chi-Square

	DOES NOT APPLY	VERY UNSAT	SOME-WHAT UNSAT	FAIRLY SATIS	VERY SATIS	CHI SQ
30. The one-credit General Orientation class (Psy. 100).						
Persisters	12.0	53.3	13.3	18.7	2.7	11.513*
Dropouts	7.3	29.3	22.0	26.8	14.6	
34. Assistance from instructors on study techniques and other concerns related to classes.						
Persisters	5.3	1.3	5.3	34.7	53.3	12.841*
Dropouts	9.5	4.8	21.4	38.1	26.2	
45. The emphasis on cultural and intellectual pursuits outside of class.						
Persisters	13.9	6.9	33.3	40.3	5.6	13.220*
Dropouts	28.6	23.8	23.8	19.0	4.8	
47. Recreational facilities on the campus.						
Persisters	9.3	24.0	26.7	26.7	13.3	10.243*
Dropouts	7.1	52.4	19.0	16.7	4.8	
56. Campus publications reflecting what the student body wants to read and what the students are thinking.						
Persisters	4.2	37.5	34.7	22.2	1.4	12.425*
Dropouts	4.8	16.7	31.0	33.3	14.3	

*$p > .05$

Table 5

Reasons for Discontinuing:
Rank Order of Items with 12 Per Cent
or More Positive Response

RANK	REASON	PER CENT RESPONDING TRUE
(1.0)	82. Decided that another school would offer more of what I was interested in.	61.0
(2.0)	80. A general feeling of "not getting anywhere."	58.5
(3.0)	75. Lacked interest in studies.	43.9
(4.5)	65. Took a full-time job.	41.5
(4.5)	67. Unhappy about school.	41.5
(6.0)	83. Did not like the social atmosphere.	34.1
(7.0)	74. Military service (enlisted).	24.4
(8.5)	62. Financial difficulties.	19.5
(8.5)	70. Discouraged by low grades.	19.5
(10.0)	86. Did not know how to study.	17.5
(11.0)	81. Found that I was not suited for the special program I thought I was interested in.	17.1
(12.0)	68. It took too long to commute.	14.6
(13.5)	79. Friends left school.	12.2
(13.5)	85. No time to study.	12.2

REFERENCES

Aiken, James. A comparison of junior college withdrawees. ERIC ED 023 389, 1968.

Black, H. P. The efficiency of the ACT program and high school grades for predicting the achievement of Chesapeake College students. ERIC ED 029 626, Jan, 1969.

Cohen, Arthur M. Selected personality correlates of junior college dropouts and persisters. ERIC ED 027 883, Mar, 1969.

Elias, E. M., Lindsey, O. A. The role of intellective variable in achievement and attrition of associate degree students at the York Campus for the years 1959-63. ERIC ED 030 406, Sept, 1968.

Hannah, William. The leavers view. ERIC ED 029 628, 1969.

Hughes, Harold G. A followup study on discontinuing students at Grossmont College. ERIC ED 019 085, 1968.

McGeever, John, Burton, R. L. A survey of dropouts and discontinuing students and their attitudes toward selected aspects of the junior college program. ERIC ED 013 642, May 1965.

Pervin, Lawrence A. Dissatisfaction with college and the college dropout--a transactional approach. ERIC ED 021 335, Aug, 1967.

Rice, Gary A., Scofield, William. A contrast between the "successful" and "dropout" student at Yakima Valley College. ERIC ED 030 416, Mar, 1969.

Roueche, John E. Research studies of the junior college dropout. ERIC ED 013 659, Oct, 1967.

Wenzel, Gustave, Hansen, M. Duane. Attrition Rate Study. ERIC ED 015 738, 1968.

Wood, Samuel E. Relationship of certain nonintellective factors to persistence. ERIC ED 023 374, 1968.

APPENDIX

Weigel

ANOKA-RAMSEY STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE

11200 Mississippi Boulevard N.W.
Coon Rapids, Minnesota 55433
Telephone 427-2600

April 3, 1970

Dear (Former) Anoka-Ramsey Student:

This year, for the first time, people who enter junior colleges outnumber those students entering four-year colleges. The growth of the junior college has been so rapid that there is still much we need to know about why people decide to attend junior college and even more about why they decide to discontinue after entering college. This survey of Anoka-Ramsey students and former students is an attempt to find out why people originally decided to attend Anoka-Ramsey and why some of the students decided not to return for the second year.

This questionnaire is being sent to about one out of six men who entered Anoka-Ramsey in the fall of 1968 selected on a random basis. You may be in that group of students still attending Anoka-Ramsey, or you may have decided not to return for this school year. Either way, your response to the survey is requested and is very necessary to make the study valid and valuable. The answers you give will not be identified with your name, but will be totaled with other men who returned or did not return to Anoka-Ramsey.

Please answer the questionnaire as soon as possible and return it in the enclosed envelope. (Mr. Weigel is on leave of absence this year and will analyze the results at the University of Missouri.)

We appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mark Weigel
Counselor

Don L. Johnson
Dean of Students

MW/DJ:rg

Weigel

If the person to whom the questionnaire was mailed is not available to answer the questions, please return the answer sheet in the enclosed envelope.

Please indicate on the answer sheets your response to the questions. Blanks, such as "Name", "Grade", "Class", etc., are not necessary to the survey and should be left blank. The coded information under "Student Number" will be used only to determine who has not responded to the survey.

Use a number two pencil to blacken the box corresponding to the letter answer you want for each question. Notice that the answer blanks on the answer sheet proceed across the page rather than in columns.

RETURN ONLY THE ANSWER SHEET.

STUDENT FOLLOW-UP STUDY

I. GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. What was your marital status when you entered Anoka-Ramsey?

   A. SINGLE B. MARRIED C. DIVORCED

2. Were you a veteran when you entered Anoka-Ramsey?

   A. TRUE B. FALSE

3. How many hours per week did you work at an outside job while attending Anoka-Ramsey?

   A. NONE B. 1 to 10 C. 11 to 20 D. 21 to 30 E. 31 or more

4. How long after high school did you start junior college?

   A. LESS THAN 1 YEAR
   B. MORE THAN 1 BUT LESS THAN 2 YEARS
   C. MORE THAN 2 BUT LESS THAN 4 YEARS
   D. MORE THAN 4 BUT LESS THAN 6 YEARS
   E. 6 OR MORE YEARS AFTER

5. What kind of program were you in when you entered Anoka-Ramsey?

   A. GENERAL B. TRANSFER C. TECHNICAL (Bus,, Engin. Tech., Nursing)

6. What was the highest degree that you planned when you entered?

   A. GENERAL B. ASSOCIATE C. BACHELOR D. MASTER E. DOCTOR

7. Are you now attending Anoka-Ramsey?

   A. TRUE B. FALSE

8. If you are not now attending Anoka-Ramsey and if you have attended another school or college since leaving Anoka-Ramsey, indicate the kind of school you attended.

   A. PUBLIC OR PRIVATE TECHNICAL-VOCATIONAL
   B. ANOTHER JUNIOR COLLEGE
   C. STATE UNIVERSITY
   D. STATE COLLEGE
   E. PRIVATE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY

9. If you have not continued at Anoka-Ramsey and have not enrolled in another school or college, mark the answer sheet for the statement that fits your plans.

   A. NO PLANS TO ATTEND COLLEGE AGAIN
   B. PLANS TO RESUME COLLEGE WORK LATER
   C. UNDECIDED REGARDING FUTURE PLANS TO ATTEND COLLEGE

II. COLLEGE ENTRANCE:

Below are some of the reasons students have given for attending Anoka-Ramsey. Looking back at the time when you decided to attend college, show the degree of importance the reasons listed below had for you. Please do not leave any items blank.

React to each statement using this code:
   A. DOES NOT APPLY
   B. OF SLIGHT IMPORTANCE
   C. OF MODERATE IMPORTANCE
   D. OF GREAT IMPORTANCE

10. I had an interest in one field in which I wanted to specialize.
11. My high school teachers and counselors thought I was good college material.
12. I was uncertain about what kind of work I wanted to do and I thought that college would help me decide.
13. I thought that college could make me a better husband and father.
14. College would give me a more influential voice in community affairs.

15. I have always liked to study and learn about new things.
16. I thought that college would give me the chance to meet people.
17. There was never any question on whether or not I would go to college.
18. I did not want to get drafted.
19. I thought that college was the best place to learn to get along with people.

20. All of my friends were going to college.
21. I wanted to prepare for a better paying job.
22. People who I knew and respected outside school encouraged me to go.
23. Going to college was the only way I could find out about my abilities and vocational interests.
24. There was not much else for me to do but go to college.

25. I felt that to know what is going on these days you have to go to college.
26. My test scores indicated that I would be successful in college.

III. APPRAISAL OF COLLEGE SERVICES:

An attempt is being made in this study to get honest and realistic appraisals by college students of their experience while in college. Listed below are some of the services and facilities offered to Anoka-Ramsey students. Please do not leave any items blank.

Indicate your appraisal of these services by using the following code:

A. DOES NOT APPLY
B. VERY UNSATISFACTORY
C. SOMEWHAT UNSATISFACTORY
D. FAIRLY SATISFACTORY
E. VERY SATISFACTORY

27. Service of admissions office before the beginning of school.
28. The orientation program prior to the first day of school.
29. Registration procedures and priorities.
30. The one-credit General Orientation class (Psy. 100).
31. The quality of teaching by the instructors.

32. The size of the classes.
33. The opportunity for interesting electives courses.
34. Assistance from instructors on study techniques and other concerns related to classes.
35. Opportunity for counseling concerning problems related to classes.
36. Opportunity for informal social contacts with the faculty and administration.

37. Opportunity for counseling and testing to help determine educational and vocational goals.
38. Quality of counseling received on problems of educational or vocational choice.
39. Opportunity for interesting student activities.
40. Opportunity for social contacts with other students. Chance to get to know other students.
41. Library facilities and services, including study carrels, availability of needed books and materials, a general willingness to help.

42. Assistance of college officials to aid in finding part-time or full-time work.
43. The availability of courses and facilities in my major academic field.
44. Availability of selective service (draft) information.
45. The emphasis on cultural and intellectual pursuits outside of class.
46. The opportunity to apply for and receive financial aid.

47. Recreational facilities on the campus.
48. The ability of instructors to set forth clear cut and interesting course objectives.
49. The services of the business office.
50. Knowing what services are provided by the college.

Using the same rating scale as above, please indicate your appraisal of the following:

51. College rules in academic life (class cuts, degree requirements, probation,etc)
52. College rules in social life of the student.
53. The general types of students attending Anoka-Ramsey
54. The intellectual life on campus.
55. What students wear to class.

56. Campus publications reflecting what the student body wants to read and what the students are thinking.
57. Representative student government.
58. The opportunity for student voices to be heard in administrative or faculty decisions.

IV. REASONS FOR DISCONTINUING: (Fill out this section if you did not return to Anoka-Ramsey this school year.)

Less than half of the students entering a junior college return for the second year. Please indicate on the answer sheet in column A (or T) if the reason given is true for you. If false, indicate false in column B (or F).

59. Illness or physical disability to self.
60. Illness or physical disability to family.
61. College work too difficult.
62. Financial difficulties.
63. Needed at home.

64. Marital difficulties.
65. Took a full-time job.
66. Got married or planned to get married soon.
67. Unhappy about school.
68. It took too long to commute.

69. Moved out of the area.
70. Discouraged by low grades.
71. Academic failure (dismissed).
72. Dismissed for disciplinary reasons.
73. Military service (drafted).

74. Military service (enlisted).
75. Lacked interest in studies.
76. Did not have the proper academic background.
77. Housing problems.
78. Could not meet prerequisites of special programs.

79. Friends left school.
80. A general feeling of "not getting anywhere".
81. Found that I was not suited for the special program I thought I was interested in.
82. Decided that another school would offer more of what I was interested in.
83. Did not like the social atmosphere.

84. No place to study.
85. No time to study.
86. Did not know how to study.

Thank you for your cooperation.

RETURN ONLY THE ANSWER SHEET.

Weigel

214 NROTC
University of Missouri
Columbia, Mo. 65201

Dear (Former) Anoka-Ramsey Student:

On April 3rd, Don Johnson, the new Dean of Students at Anoka-Ramsey, and I sent a questionnaire to you and some of the other men who entered A-R in the Fall of 1968. This questionnaire was to be used in the assessment of the college by the students who returned and those who did not return for the Fall of 1969.

I have not received your answer sheet. And the reason that I am again asking for your answers is that the study will mean little without a complete response from the men who were randomly chosen for the study. Without your help an accurate appraisal cannot be made.

What we are especially interested in is whether or not Anoka-Ramsey gave you what you wanted or expected in a junior college. In order for good programs to develop and bad practices to be modified we need feedback on what you experienced and thought about while you were at Anoka-Ramsey. This kind of questionnaire is designed to give us this information in a workable form.

The deadline for my report was to be May 1st, but if you would please return the filled-in answer sheet to me by May 5th I will be able to include your reaction in the study.

The questionnaire should take about 30 minutes of your time. The answer sheet need only be filled to number 86 for those who are no longer attending Anoka-Ramsey and to number 58 for those still attending.

PLEASE

Sincerely,

Mark Weigel
Counselor

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST
AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED